

Appl. No. 10/045,578
Am't. Dated August 18, 2006
Reply to Office Action of June 8, 2006

Attorney Docket No. 81747.0212
Customer No.: 26021

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated June 8, 2006. Claims 1-18 remain in this application. Claims 1, 8 and 16 are the independent Claims. Reconsideration and entrance of the amendment in the application are respectfully requested.

Art-Based Rejections

Claims 1, 7-8 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over "OLE for Retail POS – Application Programmer's Guide" (Epson) in view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2001/0029534 (Spinks); Claims 2-6, 9-13 and 15-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Epson in view of Spinks and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,711,558 (Gresham). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and submits that the claims herein are patentable in light of the arguments below.

The Epson et al. Reference

The Epson reference (OLE for Retail POS – Application Programmer's Guide) provides guidance to application developers and hardware providers relating to OPOS controls. The OPOS control has a Service Object that passes information to a Control Object by reporting events. (*See, Epson, Page 11*). The Service Object reports a status change data that indicates a change in device status. Epson refers to this function as StatusUpdateEvent, which reports a change in the device's status. (*See, Epson, Page 22*).

The Gresham Reference

Gresham is directed to an event detector that detects a plurality of different possible asynchronous events from any of a plurality of source addresses and nodes,

Appl. No. 10/045,578
Am. lt. Dated August 18, 2006
Reply to Office Action of June 8, 2006

Attorney Docket No. 81747.0212
Customer No.: 26021

debounces the event and, once a valid event has been identified and confirmed, formats and transmits a message via a message transport system to a predetermined destination address for further appropriate action. Each event is time-stamped so that latency in the message transport system does not affect time-critical events. Thus, the transmitted message identifies the source address, source node, an event number for identifying the event, and a time-stamp associated with the event.. (See, *Gresham*, Col. 1, lines 45-56).

The Spinks et al. Reference

Spinks et al. is directed to methods and apparatus for physically locating and tracking devices connected to a network from a central point using the network cable infrastructure to which the devices connect. (See, *Spinks*, para. 3)

The Claims are Patentable Over the Cited References

The present application is generally directed to a device status monitoring system and method for a data processing system.

As defined by independent Claim 1, a device status monitoring system in a data processing system includes a peripheral device connected to a host computer. The host computer runs an operating system and an application capable of controlling the peripheral device. The host computer includes a device control system for controlling the peripheral device through the operating system. The device control system includes a first object providing a device class interface to the application and a second object providing an interface for the peripheral device to the first object. The device status monitoring system includes a status change data recording unit in the second object for continuously recording status change data

Appl. No. 10/045,578
Amplt. Dated August 18, 2006
Reply to Office Action of June 8, 2006

Attorney Docket No. 81747.0212
Customer No.: 26021

indicating each sequential change in a device status to a status change recording unit.

The applied references do not disclose or suggest the above features of the present invention as defined by independent Claim 1. In particular, the applied references do not disclose or suggest a, "... a status change data recording unit in the second object for continuously recording status change data indicating each sequential change in a device status...", as required by independent Claim 1.

On page 17, Epson discloses that the rules for the status model and that each device class specify the status changes that cause it to fire the StatusUpdateEvent. Accordingly, Epson teaches that only a subset of status changes would cause it to fire a StatusUpdateEvent.

Even assuming ,arguendo, that the firing of a StatusUpdateEvent is the same as "recording status change data", required by Claim 1, Epson fails to teach or suggest "recording ...each sequential change in a device status...", as required by that claim.

Further still, Applicants respectfully submit that Epson teaches away from any combination that would remedy this deficiency. Epson is an Application Programmer's Guide that is targeted to developers who want to interface with a standard OLE for Retail POS system. Accordingly, it describes a formal standard that needs to be followed by all developers in order to make systems that are compatible with each other. By disclosing that that each device class specify the status changes that cause it to fire the StatusUpdateEvent, Epson defines a property of an OLE for Retail POS system and teaches away from anything that would deviate from that definition. Any such deviation could result in a system that is incompatible with a standard OLE for Retail POS system, and thus a system

Appl. No. 10/045,578
Am't. Dated August 18, 2006
Reply to Office Action of June 8, 2006

Attorney Docket No. 81747.0212
Customer No.: 26021

that is in operable for its intended use. Accordingly, Epson teaches away from any such combination.

As discussed above, the ancillary Spinks and Gresham fail to remedy the deficiencies of Epson, at least for the reason that Epson teaches away from any such combination.

Since the applied references do not disclose or suggest the above features of the present invention as required by amended independent Claim 1, those references cannot be said to anticipate nor render obvious the invention which is the subject matter of that claim.

Accordingly, independent Claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully suggests that independent claims 8 and 16, are allowable for at least the same reasons as discussed above with reference to amended independent Claim 1.

The remaining Claims 2-7, 9-15 and 17-18 depend directly or indirectly from independent Claims 1, 8 and 16 and recite additional features of the invention which are neither disclosed nor fairly suggested by the applied references, and are also believed to be in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los

Appl. No. 10/045,578
Am. It. Dated August 18, 2006
Reply to Office Action of June 8, 2006

Attorney Docket No. 81747.0212
Customer No.: 26021

Angeles, California telephone number (213) 337-6809 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: August 18, 2006

By:



Dariush G. Adli
Registration No. 51,386
Attorney for Applicant(s)

500 South Grand Avenue, Suite 1900
Los Angeles, California 90071
Phone: 213-337-6700
Fax: 213-337-6701